

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/734,725	JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID E. ENGLAND	2443	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID E. ENGLAND.

(3) Robert S. McConnell.

(2) Sean D. Solberg Reg. No. 48653.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5 and 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Barroux.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David E. England/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Attorney of record and Applicant contacted the Examiner per requirement for "First Action Interview" process to discuss possible claim amendments to overcome the prior art. The purposed claim amendments seemed to overcome the rejection that was previously stated but would need further searching to determine patentability. Attorney has since then submitted an entire new set of claims while canceling the previously amended claims. The new claims have more than what was previously discussed in the interview but still have some of the same material that was discussed before. The Attorney is invited to contact the Examiner again if they feel it would further prosecution again..